

25X1A9A

1. Mr. [REDACTED] has done a fine job of delineating the extent and variety of FI functions on a Task Force. However, when one has the opportunity to scrutinize the written labors of the pioneer writer several thoughts suggest themselves.

2. In paragraph 2 of the basic memorandum the writer distinguishes between the two levels at which FI operates, the overall unit and the specialized units within components which service their particular sections. I believe that the paper would read easier if that overall unit were described as the Intelligence Group rather than FI, while reserving FI for the function performed within the specialized sections. The first sentence of paragraph 2 assumes that the amassing of considerable information on the target area will precede the setting up of a Task Force. This is true enough but it prompts questions such as, who will amass the information?--who will perform this basic research? Much or most of this type of research is overt, but can it be done by overt elements because of security implications? Would they be willing to do it? If you will recall early in 1960 we spent 500 man hours within the FI staff producing a summary which by its very nature should more properly have been done by the FBI, the CI Staff, or the CE component of the Division involved.

3. In the same paragraph 2 the writer assigns to the Intelligence Group the obligation of providing the Task Force with all available information outside of support data. Presumably, support data means intelligence information. Who will supply this type of information? That point is not covered here and the overall FI unit (which I shall continue to refer to as the Intelligence Group) is specifically excluded from responsibility. Yet, by inference, paragraph 3 seems to indicate that the Intelligence Group should be responsible for getting information (presumably including support data). If this function is not placed within the Intelligence Group, where will it be placed?

4. Paragraph 3 says that the Intelligence Group will consist of a Chief, case officers, and a Reports element. Of course such a terse statement gives no idea of just what the writer had in mind as to size. However, from purely an organizational standpoint the list of responsibilities mentioned throughout the paper would indicate that a broader organization is needed if the Intelligence Group is to fulfill its multifold responsibilities. As I see it, the Intelligence Group has the following functions:

a. It collects, processes, and disseminates information of interest to other Task Force sections and non-Task Force supporting elements.

b. It serves as an area collection unit for intelligence for the Agency and the Intelligence Community as a whole.

SECRET

- c. It receives requirements levied on it by special sections.
- d. It receives information from specialized units.
- e. It is responsible for insuring prompt transmission of information by the Communications Section.
- f. It provides intelligence to forward echelons.
- g. It produces briefs and assessments, and finished intelligence. I presume that the writer meant "finished intelligence" when he stated that it is a function of the Group to draw conclusions from intelligence and present those conclusions to the Task Force Commander and at his direction to other interested persons. And later the writer mentions that the chief of the Group may have to go further in the way of committing himself on the significance of data than he normally would, but the making of such assessments is the highest function of intelligence.
- h. It maintains liaison with other Agency units, other U.S. Services, and foreign services.

5. In view of the number and type of fixed responsibilities placed on the Intelligence Group it seems to me that a more realistic organization would provide for the following breakdown within the Group:

- a. An Ops unit
- b. Reports and Requirements unit
- c. An assessment or research unit
- d. A Liaison unit
- e. An Intelligence Watch unit

Actually there is nothing sacrosanct about organization, and several of these five units could be combined very easily. However, the list of responsibilities mentioned in paragraph 3 above indicates that these responsibilities are at least translatable organizationally speaking into a Group with the five specified functional units.

6. In paragraph 6 there is a breakdown of the intelligence unit of the Paramilitary which I gather is intended to be typical of the internal structure of the other sections. It is not at all clear to me whether or not these various units will operate through the Intelligence Group in conducting liaison or go directly to producers. There may be some duplication of responsibility here as indicated in paragraph 6d.

7. In general, it seems to me that the writer should take another good look at the functions which he has set forth for various components

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

of the Task Force. Some of those which appear at first glance to belong strictly to the Intelligence Group or overall FI seem to be susceptible of better handling within the Special Sections. It is of course quite proper that there be a requirements responsibility in each component as well as in the Intelligence Group. However, the line of demarcation between individual sections and the Intelligence Group is rather fuzzy in the field of Liaison and assessment or research.

~~SECRET~~